

REMARKS

Claims 24-28 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 17, and 18 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. New claims 29 and 30 have been added. Claims 1-23 and 29-30 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 17 and 18 have been amended in a manner believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 of those claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Independent Claim 1 has been amended in a manner believed to overcome the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph of that claim. As Claims 2-23 depend from Claim 1, the Examiner's rejection of those dependent claims is believed to have been overcome, accordingly.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the article "Business-to-Business online auctions: key issues for purchasing process improvement" (hereinafter referred to as "B-to-B"). The Examiner has also rejected Claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over B-to-B in view of the article "Stamp Center." Those rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 1, neither alone nor in combination do B-to-B and Stamp Center disclose "determining whether the total of the transport value of all lanes included within the lot exceeds a predetermined amount" and "increasing at least one of the origination area and the destination area of the lot to include more lanes within the lot, if it is determined that the total of the transport value for all lanes included within the lot does not exceed a predetermined amount, until the total of the transport value of all lanes included within the lot exceeds a predetermined amount" as recited in amended Claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-23 depend from Claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

New Claim 29 recites a system for carrying out the method of Claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

New Claim 30 recites a computer program product for carrying out the method of Claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for the reasons described above.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/21/07



Robyn Wagner
Registration No. 50,575
V 408-973-2596
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014